REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1-23 and 25 are allowed. Claim 24 has been amended. Claim 25 has been amended to correct antecedent basis. In light of the following, all of the claims are in condition for allowance. But if, after considering this response, the Examiner does not agree that all of the claims are allowable, the Examiner is requested to schedule a teleconference with the Applicants' attorney to further the prosecution of the application.

Rejection of claim 24 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizuta (US 5,828,892) in view of Nelson (EP 1107437A2)

Claim 24

Claim 24, as amended, recites simultaneously providing a plurality of source input voltages.

For example, referring to the sole figure of the patent application, a plurality of source input voltages 82, 84, 86 are simultaneously provided to the power system 10. It should be noted that the plurality of source input voltages 82, 84, 86 are all provided at the same time, and then ORed to provide a single source voltage (at nodes 44 and 46). Furthermore, it should be noted that the source input voltages 82, 84, 86 may be different types of input sources. For example, one source input voltage may be a DC voltage, while another source input voltage may be an AC voltage.

Mizuta, on the other hand, does not teach simultaneously providing a plurality of source input voltages. Instead, Mizuta simply teaches providing a single power supply voltage (provided by an information processing device) to a power supply voltage control circuit (col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 32). This power supply voltage control circuit then compares the single power supply voltage to a working voltage of an integrated circuit memory. If the single power supply voltage is greater than the working voltage, then the single power supply voltage is converted to the working voltage. If the single power supply voltage is equal to the working voltage, then the single power supply voltage is passed through intact. However, it should be noted that only a single power supply voltage is provided to the power supply voltage

control circuit at any given time. This power supply voltage may be either 5 V or 3.3 V, but at any given time, it is still only a single power supply voltage. All this has nothing to do with simultaneously providing a plurality of power supply voltages. In fact, after reviewing Mizuta in its entirety, the Applicants' attorney is unable to find any mention of simultaneously providing a plurality of power supply voltages. As a result, Mizuta does not satisfy the limitations of claim 24.

Furthermore, the Examiner states that Nelson teaches coupling a first diode output to a second diode output, and thus, ORing first and second power supply voltages. However, there is no motivation to combine Nelson with Mizuta because Mizuta only teaches a single power supply voltage. As a result, the teachings of Nelson do not even apply to the single power supply voltage of Mizuta.

Therefore, the combination of Mizuta and Nelson do not render claim 24 obvious.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

In the event any fees are due as a result of this amendment, you are hereby authorized to charge overpayment or deficiencies in payment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

If, after considering this response, the Examiner does not agree that all of the claims are allowable, then it is respectfully requested that the Examiner schedule a phone interview with the Applicants' attorney at (425) 455-5575.

DATED this 13th day of February, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP

Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 57,898

155-108th Avenue N.E., Ste 350

Bellevue, WA 98004-5973